7

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated June 15, 2004. Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 2, 3 and 14-16 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 13-19 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reber et al* in view of *Light et al* and further in view of *Official Notice*. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 14 in view of *Reber*, *Official Notice* and *Light et al*. As described previously, Applicants' present inventive concept is directed toward the concept of obtaining a bar code that is associated at a second location with profile information of the user. This profile information can include shipping preferences, credit card information, etc. When the user provides this unique code in the form of a bar code to a vendor location, the vendor location has the ability to utilize that bar code to access the location at which the stored profile information is contained. (Note that what is transmitted is the information extracted from the bar code.) The vendor location can then retrieve this profile information and prepare the form in accordance therewith. This allows the form associated with the transaction to have such information as the user's name, address, shipping information and credit card number placed into the form. This partially or completely filled in form is then transferred from the vendor to the user for viewing and acceptance. It is the use of this unique code that is provided to the vendor that allows the vendor to make certain decisions and to determine how the form is to be filled in, since it has a unique code to allow the vendor to access such information. Therefore, when the user receives the form, the form is already filled in and completed. This is different from systems that existed prior to the invention in that the user had to take some action to fill the form in, as opposed to just sending the unique code. This allows the user to basically enter into a payment transaction that requires nothing more than the code which will result in a filled out form being returned to the user.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N 09/382,426
Atty. Dkt No. PHLY-24,732

8

The *Reber* reference, as noted in the previous response, provides a bar code that identifies an individual. This bar code is transmitted during a transaction for the purpose of verifying that transaction. Once verified, the transaction can then proceed. However, the bar code has encoded directly therein all of the information that is used for the verification process. There is no association of that bar code with profile information. Therefore, the identifying bar code is utilized for a verification process to allow the user to access some feature or to initiate a transaction. The Examiner has indicated that it is well known to utilize a form to collect data. However, the Examiner has indicated that what *Reber* and *Official Notice* lack is any teaching that the form can be automatically filled in. However, what *Reber* and *Official Notice* also lack is any teaching that the unique bar code identifying that individual can be utilized by the vendor in the transaction for the purpose of determining what will happen with the form. Therefore, *in response* to the vendor location receiving the processing bar code, profile information in Applicants' system is obtained from the second location. There is no disclosure or suggestion in *Reber* and the *Official Notice* that in any way indicates that this personal bar code would be utilized to obtain profile information from a second location. There is nothing more than a match suggested. The *Light et al* reference is disclosed for providing the automatic fill in of the form. That is exactly what the *Light et al* reference does. When a form is received, a program takes over and, while the user is viewing the program, steps through each of the fields, determines if the field is tagged and, if tagged, then it compares it with a data base to see if there is associated information therein that can be used to fill in a particular field. After that field is filled in, the next field in the form is examined to determine if a tag exists in that field. This continues until all fields are filled in. If no tag is in a field, the user is prompted for information. If the user fills in the information and pushes enter, then the next field is looked at. Some fields are user prompt fields only and will not be filled in by the data base. However, there is no suggestion that a vendor would fill the form in *prior to* sending it to the user, and utilizing the bar code as a pointer for accessing the profile information. Although *Light et al* does teach that there will be some data base that is populated by the user for the express purpose of comparing to the form and filling that form in, there is no discussion as to how that form is accessed other than when the form is sent to the user with no information therein. The Applicants can only surmise that there must be some recognition of the user in order to access the data base associated with that user for extracting such things as e-mail addresses, etc. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Light et al* that

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N 09/382,426
Atty. Dkt. No. PHLY-24,732

9

would result in the user sending a bar code or unique number to a vendor location which the vendor would then utilize for the purpose of populating a form and then sending this populated form back to the user. *Reber et al* reference and *Official Notice* do not suggest any type of vendor initiated activity that is done in response to receiving the bar code other than to verify that the user can continue with the particular transaction. If the transaction involved an auto fill in form, then the form would be sent back to the user empty and then the user would fill it in. It is the lack of this recognition by the vendor that the unique code was associated with profile information, access of that profile information, filling in of the form and then returning the *complete* form back to the user that is missing in the combination of cited references. Therefore, Applicants believe that Claims 1 and 14 are not anticipated or obviated by the combination of *Reber* and *Light* in view of the *Official Notice* and, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection with respect to the Claims 1 and 14. With respect to the remaining claims, Claims 2-6, 13, 16-19 and 26, these are dependent claims and are also believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 10 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reber et al.* in view of *Green et al.* Applicants note that the limitation in *Reber* missing is the completion of the form utilizing a unique address, wherein the unique address in the form of a bar code is sent to the second location for retrieval of the profile information therefrom, this profile information utilized for the completion of a form at the vendor prior to sending it to the user. There is no suggestion in *Green* as to completing the form in response to receiving this unique code prior to sending it back to the user. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection with respect to Claims 10 and 23.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reber et al* in view of *Gardenswartz*. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

The *Gardenswartz* reference provides a registration server that is programmed for the storing of information. There is no disclosure in *Gardenswartz* that would provide for transmission of profile

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N 09/382,426
Atty. Dkt. No. PHLY-24,732

10

information to the vendor in response to the vendor receiving a unique bar code, which profile information will be utilized to fill in a form at the vendor's site and then transmit the filled in form to the user at the user site after the form is filled in. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection with respect to Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PHLY-24,732 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Gregory M. Howison
Registration No. 30,646

GMH/yoc/cr

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
December 14, 2004

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N 09/382,426
Atty. Dkt No. PHLY-24,732